DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 713 UD 020 802

AUTHOR Kanowith, V.
TITLE Teacher Attitudes and the Spanish Bilingual Program.
PUB DATE May 80
NOTE 52p.: M.A. Thesis, Kean College of New Jersey. Best copy available.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes: *Bilingual Education: *Educational Philosophy: Elementary Education: Program Administration: Questionnaires: Spanish Speaking: *Teacher Attitudes: *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS New Jersey (Newark)

ABSTRACT

This study sought to reveal teachers' and administrators' attitudes and opinions toward bilingual education. A questionnaire was administered to staff members both in and outside the bilingual program at Roberto Clemente school (a predominantly Hispanic school in Newark, New Jersey) in order to determine attitudinal commonalities and/or differences among those in and outside the program. It was hypothesized that teachers not involved in the bilingual program would tend to reject the program's operational procedures, though not necessarily its philosophy. It was also hypothesized that teachers involved in the program would tend to accept both the procedures and the philosophy, though their acceptance may be based on factors related to personal security. Analysis of collected data indicated that regardless of the individual teaching position at the school, teachers' attitudes and perceptions toward bilingual education, its implications, and its implementation were at variance and often contradictory. This paper includes a copy of the questionnaire used in the study, as well as a review of related research on teacher attitudes toward bilingual education. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JUN 30 1980

ED190713

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEACHER ATTITUDES AND THE SPANISH BILINGUAL PROGRAM

by

V. Kanowith

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
V. Kanowith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted in partial fulfullment of the requirement
for the Master of Arts degree in Education at
Kean College of New Jersey
May 1980

VD020802

ABSTRACT

This study sought to reveal teachers' and administrators' attitudes and opinions toward bilingual education, as perceived by teachers both in and outside the bilingual program at Roberto Clemente School in Newark, New Jersey. An opinionnaire was administered in order to determine possible attitudinal commonalities and/or differences among those in and outside of the program. Analysis of collected data indicated that regardless of the individual teaching position at this school, teachers' attitudes and perceptions toward bilingual education, its implications and its implementation, were at variance and often contradictory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Teacher Attitudes and the Spanish Bilingual Program

Hypothesis 1

Importance of the Study 2

Definition of Terms 3

Assumptions 3-4

Limitations 4-5

Research Design 5

Sample 9

Findings 10-26

Conclusions 26-29

II. Teacher Attitudes and the Spanish Bilingual Program: Related Research 30-39

III. References 40-42

IV. Appendix

Introductory letter with explanation of the opinionnaire 43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I: Responses From 18 Teachers and Administrators in the Bilingual Program . . . 10

TABLE II: Responses From 27 Teachers Not In the Bilingual Program 16

TABLE III: Compilation of Data From Tables I and II 22

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure I: Opinionnaire 6-9

With the passage of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968- Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, bilingual education became an official governmental mandate, and received the yearly public funding to support it. Since its very enactment, this educational trend has been shadowed by confusion, controversy and disagreement regarding its philosophy, its policy and its procedures. Now, after witnessing a decade of bilingual education in operation, the debate rages on, with supporters and critics alike still questioning the validity of bilingual education in this country. In light of the many and varied opinions on this subject, this study was established to examine the attitudes of the staff members at Roberto Clemente School, directly or indirectly involved in the bilingual program, and how these attitudes relate to the philosophy, policy and procedures of the bilingual program in the Newark Public School System.

Hypothesis

Teachers not involved in the Spanish Bilingual Program, but affected by it, tend to reject the procedure, not necessarily the philosophy. Teachers involved in the program tend to accept the philosophy and procedure, although their acceptance may be based on other factors related to personal security.

Importance of the Study

It is a foregone conclusion that any educational innovation will be attended by controversy and differing opinion. Bilingual education has been no exception. Further complications exist since bilingual education is not just an educational method, rather, it is a willingness to accept minority group status within a country where the melting-pot syndrome has long been the American ideal. Within all this confusion, it is the classroom teacher, who, in the final analysis, is instrumental to the overall effectiveness of the program.

The significance of this study is to reveal and examine teachers' attitudes and motivation toward the concept of bilingual education and program implementation in the Newark Public School System. As a result of this investigation, the reader should become acquainted with some of the positive and negative aspects of bilingual schooling. The study should provide the reader with a clearer understanding of the problems still plaguing the bilingual program, and specifically as operated in Newark. Finally, since a review of the literature, thus far, seems to indicate a lack of evaluative studies regarding teacher attitudes, both in and out of the program, this study may result in helpful information to be considered when modifying and/or developing future program policy in Newark and elsewhere.

Definition of Terms

1. procedure(s)- can be defined as the interpretation and implementation of bilingual philosophy in terms of educational methodology.
2. philosophy- denotes the underlying beliefs and concepts of bilingual education and as mandated by the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, i.e., recognition of the need to provide special instructional programs for children of limited and/or non-English speaking ability.
3. personal security- refers to the relative security of a teaching position. Dependent upon the teaching certificate held, an individual may be included or excluded from the priority needs of his school and community. Specifically, those holding only a Bilingual Teaching Certificate would be excluded if the bilingual program were disbanded. Similarly, those holding only regular certification would be excluded if the bilingual program were expanded.

Assumptions

1. Due to the immigration structure of our country, there will always be a need for bilingual education.

2. The implementation and maintenance of bilingual instruction will continue to be supported by public funding sources.
3. The controversy attending the validity, form and effectiveness of a bilingual education in this country will persist, but the program will be maintained.
4. There is a need to develop a clearcut, comprehensive national policy regarding bilingual education.

Limitations

1. The research must be interpreted with the understanding that; (a) there is a lack of evaluative research on program impact, (b) a clearcut comprehensive national policy regarding bilingual education is, at present, non-existent, (c) there is a tremendous diversity of opinion regarding the issues and problems of bilingual education, (d) the overwhelming amount of conflicting viewpoints within the vast amount of information on bilingualism itself, tends to blur and fragment the investigation rather than bring it into focus.
2. The attitudinal study in this paper will deal with bilingual education with respect to Puerto Ricans and Cuban Americans.
3. The results of the opinionnaire may be distorted due to; (a) personal bias, (b) unwillingness of the individual to reveal his true beliefs, (c) inability of the individual to know his true beliefs.

4. The population to be sampled is small, limited to one school and is relatively similar in terms of socio-economic status.
5. Since some research information is dependent upon personal interview as well as response(s) to my letters of inquiry, the time factor will pose limitations.

Research Design

Interviews with two bilingual field coordinators in Newark (Ms. L. Gonzalez and Mrs. D. Navarro) were used to gain up-to-date information regarding the policies and procedures of bilingual education in the Newark School System. These formed the basis for the design of the opinionnaire as shown in Figure I.

The opinionnaire was distributed to forty-five (45) members of the instructional staff at Roberto Clemente School, including the three building administrators. Results were analyzed and compared for possible attitudinal commonalities and/or differences among those in and out of the bilingual program.

Figure I.

OPINIONNAIRE

Kindly respond to the following questions by placing a checkmark on the appropriate line.

A. Are you a teacher or administrator presently participating in the bilingual program?
yes____ no____

B. If not presently a teacher within the bilingual program, were you ever a teacher in the program?
yes____ no____

C. Is your native language English?
yes____ no____

If not, please indicate your na ive language._____

D. Do you speak more than one language fluently?
yes____ no____

Are you able to read and write in that language fluently?
yes____ no____

E. How do you describe yourself?
White____ Black____ Hispanic____ Other____

_____

The following statements represent opinions, and your agreement or disagreement will be determined on the basis of your particular beliefs. Please check your position as the statement first impresses you. Indicate what you believe, rather than what you think you should believe.

1. I have never been involved in the bilingual program, but would be interested in a position within the program.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____ does not apply____

2. I would be willing to learn another language in order to secure a position within the bilingual program.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____ does not apply____

3. If given the opportunity, I would like my child in a bilingual program.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

4. I am aware of the specific goals of bilingual education, as mandated by the Newark Board of Education.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

5. For the most part, I am in agreement with the goals of bilingual education as set forth by the Newark Board of Education.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

6. Bilingual education is a worthwhile educational concept.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

7. Bilingual education should be an elective choice for all students, rather than just for the limited English-speaking students.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

8. Fluency in more than one language is an asset in today's world.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

9. Knowledge of more than one culture is an asset in today's world.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

10. For the most part, I am satisfied with the operation of the bilingual program in my school.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

If not, please check any or all areas which you are, at present, dissatisfied with.

a. ____ teacher certification requirements
____ too much required
____ not enough required

b. ____ teaching materials
____ insufficient supply
____ inappropriate materials

c. ____ criteria for placement into a bilingual class

d. ____ testing instruments used to assess pupil growth

e. ____ curriculum guidelines

f. ____ administration of the program

11. It is the responsibility of non-English-speaking people to adapt to the majority language and culture.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

12. I perceive the function of the bilingual program to be the means of assimilation into the majority culture.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

13. Bilingual education should be operated as a maintenance program (i.e., a program advocating the development and maintenance of language skills in both English and the native language)
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

14. As a maintenance program, bilingual education has proven its effectiveness.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

15. Bilingual education should be operated as a transitional program (i.e., a program advocating a shift to instruction solely in English as soon as the student can perform successfully in English)
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

16. As a transitional program, bilingual education has proven its effectiveness.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

17. Bilingual education may eventually pose a threat to the security of my teaching position.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

18. Teachers need to understand the cultural differences and similarities among the children within their school.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

19. It is possible for individuals of differing ethnic groups to understand each other.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

20. Current educational trends have placed too much emphasis on the need for bilingual education.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

21. Past educational practices have dealt more effectively with the non-English-speaking child.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

22. Bilingual education should be phased out.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

23. Should the bilingual program be disbanded, my teaching position would be jeopardized.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

24. Bilingual education should be viewed as compensatory education.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

25. Bilingual education should be viewed as a step towards cultural pluralism.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

26. Teachers feel that whatever is done for the non-English-speaking child, is, in the long run done for all children.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

27. Bilingual programs are often a contradiction to what they should be.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

28. Bilingual education could be beneficial for all students regardless of their language or cultural backgrounds.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

29. The school should be instrumental in developing a bilingual-bicultural society with minority languages and cultures maintained.
agree____ disagree____ undecided____

Sample

The teacher-administrator sample of Roberto Clemente School is composed of white, black and Hispanic staff members. The ratio of white to Hispanic teachers is relatively equal, with a small proportion of black teachers. Most of the teachers can be classified as members of the middle class.

The most recent student population census, taken in October 1979, identified enrollment as 95% Hispanic, 2½% black and 2½% white.

Findings

Table I identifies the polled question by number and indicates the percentage of agreement, disagreement or indecision held by those involved in the bilingual program.

TABLE I

Responses From 18 Teachers and Administrators
In the Bilingual Program

Question	Agree	Disagree	Undecided	No Response
1*	22%	-	-	11%
2**	33%	11%	6%	6%
3	67%	11%	22%	-
4	89%	11%	-	-
5	72%	6%	22%	-
6	89%	11%	-	-
7	83%	11%	6%	-
8	100%	-	-	-
9	100%	-	-	-
10	28%	55%	17%	-
11	33%	61%	6%	-
12	50%	44%	-	6%
13	83%	11%	-	5%
14	39%	39%	22%	-
15	39%	55%	6%	-
16	28%	50%	17%	5%
17	17%	78%	5%	-
18	100%	-	-	-
19	88%	6%	-	6%
20	22%	67%	11%	-
21	11%	89%	-	-
22	-	78%	11%	11%
23	22%	56%	11%	11%
24	61%	27%	6%	6%
25	88%	6%	6%	-
26	55%	33%	6%	6%
27	83%	11%	6%	-
28	94%	-	6%	-
29	88%	6%	6%	-

*not applicable to 67% of the sample
**not applicable to 44% of the sample

As noted in this table, eighty-nine (89) percent of the administrators and teachers indicated an awareness of the specific goals of bilingual education, as mandated by the Newark Board of Education (Statement 4). Although seventy-two (72) percent were in agreement with these goals (Statement 5), fifty-five (55) percent disclosed dissatisfaction with the operation of the program within their school and seventeen (17) percent were undecided (Statement 10). When provided with the opportunity to identify any area(s) of dissatisfaction within the program, the data revealed that dissatisfaction was evidenced in all six areas listed on the opinionnaire. Eleven (11) out of fifteen (15) teachers disclosed dissatisfaction with testing instruments used to assess pupil growth and insufficient supply of teaching materials. Ten (10) revealed dissatisfaction with the administration of the program while eight (8) were dissatisfied with curriculum guidelines. Since recertification requirements have been a focus of criticism by those involved in bilingual education, it seemed rather surprising that of the eighteen (18) teachers and administrators in Table I, only seven (7) felt too much was required for teacher certification, two (2) felt not enough was required and nine (9) were not at all dissatisfied with the mandatory fulfillment of additional college courses. The three (3) building administrators were in agreement that the primary areas of dissatisfaction were criteria for placement into a bilingual

class and testing instruments. Two (2) indicated that the supply of teaching materials was insufficient. None identified the administration of the program or not enough teacher certification requirements as areas of dissatisfaction.

In response to the statement, "Bilingual education should be phased out", seventy-eight (78) percent responded negatively while eighty-nine (89) percent disagreed that "Past educational practices have dealt more effectively with the non-English-speaking child". Bilingual education was considered a worthwhile educational concept by eighty-nine (89) percent and ninety-four (94) percent agreed that "Bilingual education could be beneficial for all students regardless of their language or cultural backgrounds". It would then follow that a large number of teachers would support the statement, "Teachers feel that whatever is done for the non-English-speaking child, is in the long run done for all children", yet only fifty-five (55) percent indicated agreement. Total agreement was evidenced in viewing both fluency in more than one language and knowledge of more than one culture as assets in today's world. In light of viewing language and culture as assets, it seemed inconsistent that twenty-two (22) percent were undecided and only sixty-seven (67) percent were agreeable to the inclusion of their child (Statement 3) in the very program which was identified as a worthwhile concept and beneficial for all students regardless of their language or culture.

With regard to the type of bilingual program which should be in operation, eighty-three (83) percent favored maintenance over transitional, yet thirty-nine (39) percent agreed and disagreed as to its effectiveness (Statements 13 & 14) while twenty-two (22) percent were undecided. In light of these findings, one would assume that there would be a more definitive opinion against the transitional program. However, this was not evidenced as thirty-nine (39) percent favored transitional, fifty-five (55) percent did not and six (6) percent were undecided (Statement 15). The wide disparity in opinion seems to suggest dissatisfaction, indecisiveness and more importantly, confusion concerning the program's operation and effectiveness. Nevertheless, eighty-eight (88) percent perceived that "The school should be instrumental in developing a bilingual-bicultural society with minority languages and cultures maintained" supported by eighty-eight (88) percent who felt that "Bilingual education should be viewed as a step towards cultural pluralism".

Conflicting views within Table I were highly evident as eighty-eight (88) percent were favorable to the concept of cultural pluralism, and the same percentage agreed that the school should be instrumental in developing and maintaining that concept, yet at the same time, and suggesting contradictions, fifty (50) percent perceived the function of the bilingual program to be the means of assimilating to the majority culture, whereas forty-four (44) percent did not,

and furthermore, sixty-one (61) percent did not feel that "it is the responsibility of non-English speaking people to adapt to the majority language and culture". Moreover, as eighty-three (83) percent favored a maintenance program, which by its very nature advocates the preservation of the native and secondary language and culture, it again seemed illogical that inconsistency was revealed in response to whether or not bilingual education should be the means of assimilating to the dominant culture. Since the concepts of cultural pluralism and assimilation are in opposition with one another in their implications for bilingual education, it seemed interesting that teachers within the program were indecisive and appeared unable to identify which concept they chose to support, as evidenced by some teachers selecting both.

Bilingual education was seen as a form of compensatory education (Statement 24) by sixty-one (61) percent of the sample, perhaps implying that the teachers do not have a clear understanding of bilingual education, namely, that it is not a remedial program, but a program designed to equalize opportunities among the native and non-native pupil.

"The need to understand cultural differences and similarities among children within their school" was recognized unanimously by all of the sample. To a lesser degree, eighty-eight (88) percent believed that, "It is possible for individuals of differing ethnic groups to understand each other.

As might be expected, bilingual education did not pose a threat to seventy-eight (78) percent of the teachers involved within the program (Statement 17). In contrast, fifty-six (56) percent did not feel their jobs would be jeopardized should the program be disbanded, suggesting that acceptance of philosophy and procedure was not necessarily based on personal security (Statement 23).

Finally, eighty-three (83) percent viewed bilingual programs as a contradiction to what they should be (Statement 27), illustrating the controversy surrounding bilingual education, and perhaps explaining some of the discrepancies found in the results reported in Table I.

The following analysis utilizes the same procedure to describe the data in Table I, but it represents the attitudes and opinions held by those not in the bilingual program.

As reported in Table II, acceptance and awareness of program goals as mandated by the Newark Board of Education were viewed with relative consistancy by those both in and outside of the bilingual program (Statements 4 & 5). In contrast to the eighty-nine (89) percent of teachers and administrators within the program who indicated awareness of the specific goals of bilingual education, and the seventy-two (72) percent who were in agreement with these goals, only forty-eight (48) percent outside the program admitted awareness, and twenty-six (26) percent indicated acceptance. Similarly, as seen in Tables I and II, both teacher groups

were unable to view the operation of the program with satisfaction, as evidenced by the low percentages in agreement with Statement 10: sample one thirty-nine (39) percent;

TABLE II

Responses From 27 Teachers
Not In the Bilingual Program

Question	Agree	Disagree	Undecided	No Response
1*	26%	33%	19%	-
2**	18%	37%	26%	-
3	26%	59%	11%	4%
4	48%	44%	4%	4%
5	26%	55%	15%	4%
6	44%	37%	11%	8%
7	59%	37%	4%	-
8	89%	4%	7%	-
9	96%	-	4%	-
10	11%	78%	7%	4%
11	80%	15%	11%	4%
12	63%	15%	15%	7%
13	48%	33%	15%	4%
14	7%	67%	19%	7%
15	82%	7%	7%	4%
16	15%	55%	19%	11%
17	30%	48%	18%	4%
18	92%	4%	4%	-
19	96%	4%	-	-
20	67%	11%	18%	4%
21	63%	22%	15%	-
22	41%	30%	26%	3%
23	4%	81%	11%	4%
24	36%	41%	22%	11%
25	41%	33%	18%	8%
26	41%	48%	11%	-
27	81%	11%	4%	4%
28	67%	22%	11%	-
29	47%	34%	11%	8%

*not applicable to 22% of the sample
**not applicable to 18% of the sample

sample two eleven (11) percent. However, and as might be expected, those outside the bilingual program (seventy-eight

(78) percent) disclosed a greater degree of dissatisfaction with the operation of the program within their school, than those within the program, (fifty-five (55) percent). When provided with an opportunity to identify any area(s) of dissatisfaction within the bilingual program, both teacher groups were again, and to varying degree, dissatisfied with all areas listed on the opinionnaire. In rank order, the primary concerns of teachers involved in the bilingual program (Table I) were: testing instruments, insufficient supply of teaching materials, administration of the program and criteria for placement into a bilingual class. Eighteen (18) out of twenty-seven (27) responding teachers outside of the bilingual program reported dissatisfaction with criteria for placement, sixteen (16) identified testing instruments and fourteen (14) were dissatisfied with both curriculum guidelines and administration of the program.

In light of the dissatisfaction with program goals and program operation, as seen in Table II, it seemed rather inconsistent that a disparity of opinion was revealed in response to the statement, "Bilingual education should be phased out". Interestingly, only forty-one (41) percent of sample outside the bilingual program responded positively, thirty (30) percent negatively, while twenty-six (26) percent were undecided. In sharp contrast, and as might be expected, teachers in the bilingual program agreed that the bilingual program should be continued, with eleven (11) percent both

undecided and unable to respond. Moreover, and again in direct opposition, sixty-seven (67) percent of the sample in Table I disagreed, whereas sixty-seven (67) percent of the sample in Table II agreed that, "Current educational trends have placed too much emphasis on bilingual education". Attitudes held by those in and out of the bilingual program were once again in conflict, since bilingual education was viewed as a worthwhile concept by eighty-nine (89) percent of "in" sample but by only forty-four (44) percent of "out" sample. To a lesser degree, differing viewpoints were evidenced in a comparison of statements 26 and 28 in both tables. However, since both statements were very similar in concept, it seemed inconsistent that ninety-four (94) percent of the "in" sample, and sixty-seven (67) percent of the "out" sample perceived bilingual education as beneficial for all students regardless of their language or cultural backgrounds, yet only fifty-five (55) percent of sample one, and forty-one (41) percent of sample two were in agreement that whatever is done for the non-English-speaking child, is, in the long run done for all children. Although fluency in more than one language and knowledge of more than one culture were highly perceived as assets by teachers in each sample, both groups, nevertheless, were not highly enthusiastic about having their child participate in a bilingual program (Statement 3). Only sixty-seven (67) percent of the "in" sample, and twenty-six (26) percent of the "out" sample

indicated favorableness to the statement. Furthermore, it seems important to mention that this statement resulted in twenty-two (22) percent indecision among teachers in the "in" sample, the greatest percentage of indecision revealed within that table.

With regard to the type of bilingual program which should be in operation, eighty-two (82) percent of the "out" sample favored a transitional approach, whereas eighty-three (83) percent of the "in" sample favored maintenance. It seems significant to note that some teachers in samples one and two selected both a transitional and maintenance approach since percentages of agreement exceeded one hundred (100) percent on statements 13 and 15. Similarly, teachers in both samples were not certain that either approach had proven its effectiveness, with nineteen (19) percent of the "in" sample undecided as to the effectiveness of both maintenance and transitional, twenty-two (22) percent of the "out" sample undecided as to maintenance, and seventeen (17) percent of the "in" sample undecided as to the effectiveness of the program as a transitional device (Statements 14 and 16). The lack of an overwhelming support for either program type or its effectiveness seems to suggest that both teacher groups are confused, indecisive or perhaps, lack a clear understanding concerning this important component of bilingual education.

While eighty (80) percent of the "out" sample believed,

"It is the responsibility of non-English-speaking people to adapt to the majority language and culture", only sixty-three (63) percent perceived the function of the bilingual program to be the means of assimilation into the majority culture. Since both of the preceding statements are interrelated with the "melting-pot" theory of adapting to the majority language and culture, it would seem logical that a larger percentage would have supported the concept of assimilation. Conversely, it did follow that eighty-two (82) percent of the "out" sample favored a transitional approach to bilingual education, which by its very nature advocates a shift to instruction solely in English as soon as the student can perform successfully in that language.

Teachers in both samples disclosed high positive agreement with the statement, "Teachers need to understand the cultural differences and similarities among the children within their school". Similarly, responses from both groups overwhelmingly indicated that, "It is possible for individuals of differing ethnic groups to understand each other".

Although bilingual education is not a remedial program, it was, nevertheless, viewed as a form of compensatory education by sixty-one (61) percent of the "in" sample (Statement 24). In response to the same statement, teachers in the "out" sample were unable to form a definitive opinion, as evidenced by thirty-six (36) percent in agreement, forty-one (41) percent in disagreement, twenty-two (22) percent

undecided and eleven (11) percent unable to respond. It seems significant to mention that this particular statement drew both the highest percentage of no response, and the second highest percentage of indecision in Table II.

As would be expected, eighty-one (81) percent of the "out" sample did not feel that their jobs would be jeopardized should the bilingual program be disbanded, but surprisingly, only twenty-two(22) percent of the "in" sample were in agreement with this statement. The results seem to imply that teachers in the "in" sample are qualified for positions outside the program, and therefore, do not fear any possible demise of the program. Conversely, teachers in the "out" sample did not feel as secure in response to the statement, "Bilingual education may eventually pose a threat to the security of my teaching position", as evidenced by thirty (30) percent in agreement, forty-eight (48) percent in disagreement and eighteen (18) percent undecided.

In summation teachers in both samples were in agreement that, "Bilingual programs are often a contradiction to what they should be". It does seem ironic that both groups were able to perceive this "imperfection", yet, at the same time were entangled in the program's continuing confusion, inconsistencies and controversy.

Table III is a compilation of data from Tables I and II. It is a composite description of attitudes held by all instructional and administrative persons, both in and out of

the bilingual program.

All teachers and administrators involved in the opinionnaire study highly confirmed that fluency in more than one language and knowledge of more than one culture were

TABLE III

Compilation of Data From Tables I and II

Question	Agree	Disagree	Undecided	No Response
1*	24%	20%	11%	5%
2**	24%	26%	18%	2%
3	42%	40%	16%	2%
4	65%	31%	2%	2%
5	44%	36%	18%	2%
6	62%	27%	7%	4%
7	69%	27%	4%	-
8	93%	2%	5%	-
9	98%	-	2%	-
10	18%	69%	11%	2%
11	56%	33%	9%	2%
12	57%	26%	11%	6%
13	64%	24%	8%	4%
14	20%	56%	20%	4%
15	64%	27%	7%	2%
16	20%	53%	18%	9%
17	25%	60%	13%	2%
18	96%	2%	2%	-
19	94%	2%	2%	2%
20	49%	33%	16%	2%
21	42%	49%	9%	-
22	24%	49%	20%	7%
23	11%	71%	11%	7%
24	40%	36%	15%	9%
25	60%	22%	13%	5%
26	47%	42%	9%	2%
27	82%	11%	5%	2%
28	78%	13%	9%	-
29	64%	22%	9%	5%

*not applicable to 40% of the sample
**not applicable to 29% of the sample

assets in today's world, as evidenced by ninety-three (93)

percent and ninety-eight (98) percent agree responses on statements eight and nine. Similarly, ninety-four (94) percent of the total sample agreed that, "It is possible for individuals of differing ethnic groups to understand each other" and ninety-six (96) percent were supportive of the statement, "Teachers need to understand the cultural differences and similarities among the children within their school".

Although sixty-five (65) percent of the total sample indicated awareness of the specific goals of bilingual education, as mandated by the Newark Board of Education, the sample seemed unable to formulate a definitive opinion as to whether or not they were in agreement with those goals. The disparity of opinion included forty-four (44) percent in agreement, thirty-six (36) percent in disagreement and eighteen (18) percent undecided. With regard to the actual operation of the bilingual program within their school, sixty-nine (69) percent disclosed dissatisfaction. Although all teachers and administrators involved in the sample were, to some extent, dissatisfied with all areas listed on the opinionnaire, the data revealed that testing instruments used to assess pupil growth and criteria for placement into a bilingual class were areas of greatest dissatisfaction. To a lesser degree, but of importance, sixty-nine (69) percent of the total sample indicated dissatisfaction with curriculum guidelines, administration of the program and

insufficient supply of teaching materials, (Statement 10).

No definitive opinion prevailed in response to whether or not, "Bilingual education should be phased out", as results ranged from twenty-four (24) percent in agreement, forty-nine (49) percent in disagreement and twenty (20) percent undecided. Moreover, this statement engendered one of the two highest percentages of indecision revealed on the entire opinionnaire. At the same time, and perhaps, indicating a contradiction, sixty-two (62) percent agreed that, "Bilingual education is a worthwhile educational concept", while twenty-seven (27) percent were in disagreement. Nevertheless, seventy-eight (78) percent agreed that, "Bilingual education could be beneficial for all students regardless of their language or cultural backgrounds".

Vacillation was highly evident with regard to the type of bilingual program which should be in effect (Statements 13 and 15). At the same time, and certainly revealing mass confusion, sixty-four (64) percent favored transitional and sixty-four (64) percent favored maintenance. It appears obvious that teachers in each sample selected both approaches, since percentages exceeded one hundred (100) percent in both tables. Moreover, teachers were again uncertain as to the proven effectiveness of either the transitional or maintenance approach since fifty-six (56) percent felt maintenance had not proven its effectiveness and fifty-three (53) percent felt that transitional had not proven its effectiveness

(Statements 14 and 16). Nevertheless, sixty-four (64) percent of the total sample identified that, "The school should be instrumental in developing a bilingual-bicultural society with minority languages and cultures maintained".

One controversial issue dividing proponents of bilingual education is whether it should aim at assimilation to the dominant culture or promote preservation of ethnic differences. Statements 12 and 25 were an attempt to discover the existence of any clear-cut preference held by the sample. But once again, the results were unclear since fifty-seven (57) percent viewed the function of the bilingual program to be the means of assimilating to the majority culture, while sixty (60) percent agreed that, "Bilingual education should be viewed as a step towards cultural pluralism".

The teaching positions of seventy-one (71) percent of the total sample were not considered to be in jeopardy should the bilingual program be disbanded. To a lesser degree, sixty (60) percent were in disagreement that bilingual education may eventually pose a threat to the security of their teaching positions. These results suggest that teachers and administrators in both samples did not feel that their jobs were threatened by the continuance of bilingual education, or its demise.

In totality, eighty-two (82) percent of the total sample were in agreement that, "Bilingual programs are often

a contradiction to what they should be". An analysis of the contradictions and inconsistencies found in the data serves to illustrate and substantiate support for this statement. It is paradoxical that large numbers in the total sample were able to recognize the ongoing conflict within bilingual education, but were at the same time, often contradictory in their responses.

Conclusions

In any attempt to respond to this opinionnaire or to draw conclusions from it, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of what bilingual education is, what it implies, and how it should operate. At present, as in the past, this has not been an easy task, for the concept of bilingual education and its inherent implications have been steeped in controversy, making it one of the most poorly understood programs in American Education. This was borne out by the wide disparity of attitudes and opinions held by the teachers both in and outside of the program. By its very nature, bilingual schooling encompasses a myriad of complexities and considerations, and consequently, it can be viewed from opposing perspectives depending upon an individual's educational and philosophical beliefs, as well as the individual's personal attitudes and/or prejudices. It must be kept in mind that besides being an educational concept, bilingual education implies a willingness to accept minority group

status, and therefore, no matter how sound the concept is or how clearly it is presented, it is human nature to sometimes react emotionally out of fear and prejudice, rather than intellectually. Because of these complexities and the conflicting opinions and interests of those who examine bilingual education, either directly or indirectly, the achievement of a consensus of goals or a relatively uniform comprehensive policy has proven difficult.

It may well be that the implications of bilingual education are some of the causal factors in the uncertainties, problems and controversies which still plague the program. Now, after witnessing more than a decade of bilingual education in this country, supporters and critics alike are still debating fundamental concerns which impinge on bilingualism, including, the validity of the program in this country, whether bilingual education should aim at assimilation to the majority language or promote cultural pluralism in a country which heretofore, has valued the "melting-pot" concept, whether bilingual education should operate as transitional or maintenance programs, and the list goes on. Interrelated with these concerns are the intangible considerations, which are to some degree, linked to tendencies toward prejudice, such as, feelings toward non-native people, willingness to provide equal educational opportunities to the language minority groups and acceptance of cultural democracy.

Within this framework of reference, it is understand-

able that the resulting picture of bilingual education, as perceived by teachers in and outside of the program, was often hazy and muddled with no clear focus. Furthermore, it seemed reasonable that the vast majority of teachers and administrators both in and outside of the bilingual program viewed bilingual programs as a contradiction to what they should be. Such contradictions point out the need for further research to determine what teachers and administrators think bilingual education should be. This would be helpful in eliminating some of the confusion and misconceptions related to the program. As fundamental issues are still controversial and subject to change, it was understandable that teachers in and outside of the program were, similarly, unable at times to clarify conflicting issues. The results of the study suggest that the teachers and administrators had difficulty responding to the various concerns regarding bilingual education when the concept lacks uniformity of definition and lacks a comprehensive policy.

It was hypothesized that teachers not involved in the bilingual program would tend to reject the procedure, not necessarily the philosophy. For the most part, teachers outside the program did not overwhelmingly support or reject the underlying philosophy of bilingual education, but they were dissatisfied with the operation of the program within their school. It was also hypothesized that teachers involved in the program would tend to accept the philosophy and procedure,

although their acceptance may be based on personal security. The data revealed that teachers inside the program accepted the philosophy, but were also dissatisfied with program operation. Acceptance of the philosophy of bilingual education could not be related to personal security since the teachers indicated no particular fear of losing their jobs should bilingual education be terminated.

In summation, the lack of a relatively consistent base upon which one can view and implement bilingual education has resulted in confusion and, perhaps, this confusion has served to undermine the potential of this educational concept. The misconceptions, and differing attitudes and perceptions suggest an urgent need to redefine, unify and interrelate the fundamental components of the program. Decisions must be made as to how the program should be implemented and followed. For all its imperfections, bilingual education has potential and deserves the opportunity to mature and stabilize.

TEACHER ATTITUDES AND THE SPANISH BILINGUAL PROGRAM: RELATED RESEARCH

According to Shuy and Fasold (1973), the current preoccupation with language in its social context and concern about the importance of language in education has led to an increased interest in language attitudes and methods of investigation. However, the major problem in this type of research as Agheysi and Fishman (1970) point out, is that of validating attitudinal studies, and therefore, they make the recommendation that all studies compiled to date should be viewed with caution.

Regardless of the problems and limitations posed by the inherent nature of attitudinal investigations, further studies are certainly necessary. Christina Bratt Paulston (1979) claims that bilingual educators neglect research which deals with conflict-oriented studies for fear of having it misinterpreted by people outside of the program. One aspect of conflict-oriented research is attitudinal studies and testing and Paulston openly challenges the various disciplines to engage in this type of research since it is more valuable in determining the success of bilingual education.

Among the multitude of variables which affect the success of a given bilingual program are teachers', principals' and paraprofessionals' attitudes toward the program, the limited English-speaking community and cultural sensitivity. It is a foregone conclusion that the development of positive attitudes toward self and others is essential, both for

teachers, and for children of minority groups who must adjust to their environment (Center For Applied Linguistics, 1978).

A review of the literature has substantiated the importance of teacher attitudes as a significant variable in the learning situation. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) observed that attitudes expressed by teachers, both verbally and nonverbally, are influential in the performance of their pupils. As a result of this study, attention has been focused on teachers' attitudes toward their students' speech. Research studies conducted by Naremore (1969), Seligman, Tucker, and Lambert (1972) Frender and Lambert (1973) have indicated that teachers are prepared to assess pupils' ability on the basis of their speech. Gray and Arias (1977) found that evaluative reactions vary among individuals given certain speech samples. They concluded that teachers tend to give stereotypical responses when presented with certain cues, such as speech style, drawings and compositions. However, the research does not positively support the underlying assumption that teachers' attitudes affect pupil performance.

The attitudes of teachers not involved in bilingual programs was reported in a Montreal-based study by Campbell, Taylor, and Tucker (1973). They contend that French-speaking teachers took a much more favorable view of the French Immersion programs for English-speaking children than English-speaking teachers did. This finding is deserving of much consideration since it reveals the undercurrent of resistance

that bilingual education may face irregardless of whether or not it is successful in achieving its goals.

The Center For Applied Linguistics which serves as a national research and resource center in languages and linguistics, as well as operating the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, has identified those areas in bilingual education wherein research is urgently needed. Saville and Troike (1970) include within the areas of highest priority for research, the need to determine how to change the negative perceptions that many teachers have of Spanish-speaking children. They contend that many teachers view these children as deficient. Research on the effect of teacher attitudes on student achievement is similarly identified as an important need.

In a correspondence with Rosario C. Gingras, Information Specialist for the National Clearinghouse For Bilingual Education (October 1979), he indicated that "the attitudes of the teachers in a given program are highly influenced by the quality of the bilingual program, as well as the nature of such a program". In other words, a very poor bilingual program would be looked upon with hostility, but a very good program would be viewed positively by teachers both within and without such a program. He also recognizes the economic threat posed by the implementation of bilingual programs as an influential factor in the attitudes held by teachers, citing the hostile situation in New York City where

many tenured teachers are being replaced by bilingual teachers.

Quintana and Ramirez (1976-1977) determined the extent to which Anglo-American educators perceive bilingual-bicultural education as a form of compensatory education. Results indicated that 40 percent of the 33 educators interviewed considered bilingual education as a means for assimilation, while 57 percent viewed it more in terms of leading to self-pride and cultural awareness.

Mc Nicholas (1977) parallelled the relationships between the perceptions of parents, teachers, principals and bilingual administrators toward three components in bilingual education, namely; language, culture and instruction. It was determined that statistically significant differences were evidenced in the groups' perceptions in regard to bilingual instruction, but no significant differences were revealed toward language and culture. Although the sample leaned toward the multicultural, pluralistic concept, significant differences were found when perceptions of culture and instruction were compared by ethnicity. As a result of the findings, it was recommended that channels of communication be secured in order to insure greater understanding and uniformity of perceptions regarding bilingual education. In addition, because of the perceptual differences demonstrated by the teacher group in all three components, the development of a bilingual program with consistent philo-

sophical and instructional approaches is necessary.

In a comparison study, Medina (1973) concluded that the attitudes held by administrators were favorable as compared to the attitudes of educators who advocate bilingual programs. No statistically significant relationship was found between attitudes held and the factor of ethnicity. Administrators at the superintendency level (Juarez, 1975) felt that the major weakness of the bilingual education program is the evaluation component. Andersson and Boyer (1976) as well as numerous leaders in the field confirm this weakness, since assessment problems have plagued bilingual programs since the inception of the Bilingual Education Act. Various reports from local projects have indicated that assessment is usually not based upon the goals and objectives of the program, and that assessment instruments and procedures are inappropriate for the Spanish-speaking child.

The annual evaluation report of the Title VII Milwaukee Bilingual/Bicultural Program included observations by teachers, administrators and the Educational Resource Team. Teachers gave the program high ratings in meeting the goals of grade-level achievement and improved student self-esteem.

The American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Science (1977) conducted a study of a nationally representative sample of Spanish/English bilingual projects, totaling 38, in order to assess the impact of bilingual education on students in the cognitive and affective domains.

Students enrolled in bilingual projects during the 1975-1976 school year were compared with non-participating project students. Standardized achievement tests were administered in both languages and measured performance in language arts and math computation. Test results indicated that there was little difference between progress made by the Hispanic students in bilingual classes as compared to the Hispanic students in traditional classes. In math, those in bilingual classes did better than could have been expected in the absence of a program. In some grades, the students taught in traditional classes did slightly better in English.

Results culled from teacher questionnaires concluded that less than ½ of the pupils enrolled in the project were significantly limited in their ability to speak English, while 85 percent of the students were kept in the bilingual classes even after they were capable of learning in English.

In a recent NJEA Review (October 1979), Jacob Ornstein referred to the aforementioned survey, stating that the American Institute for Research is a respected organization that tends to be critical of achievement, and, unfortunately, bases its conclusions on a limited sampling.

Interviews with coordinators and teachers as well as teacher questionnaires were employed in order to evaluate the first year of English as a Second Language Tutorial Program in the Boulder Valley Public School System. Although the program was judged superior, additional inservice training

was recommended, and specifically to overcome the negative attitudes held by some teachers toward non-English speaking students (Stansfield, 1976).

Solomon Flores (1969) found that based upon the evaluations of five bilingual programs by local and non-local agencies in Florida, New York and Texas, the effectiveness of these programs had been established. The study concluded that most educators of limited and non-English-speaking children were in agreement that bilingual education offered a very possible solution for the special educational needs of these children. Among the problems identified within the program were evaluation procedures and teacher training.

The bilingual program at William Cullen Bryant High School in New York City was field tested in 1974. Martin Illivicky (1976), principal of the school described some chief observations; 1. Students who would be reluctant to speak in a class taught in English because of the language barrier are more apt to participate in a bilingual class. 2. The slow students are hurt by the bilingual program since they will need English in order to function in an English dominant society. 3. There was feeling among some students and teachers that progress in English was slowed because of the bilingual classes. 4. The teachers felt that the bilingual classes were most beneficial. 5. Due to differences in ability within a class, a multi-tracked program is as necessary for the bilingual student as it is for the other

students.

The concept of native language instruction became compulsory in New York City as a result of a lawsuit brought about by ASPIRA, a Puerto Rican organization. The ASPIRA Consent Decree of 1974 mandated the implementation of bilingual education programs for students deficient in English. Anemoyanis (1979) compared the attitudes of bilingual and monolingual teachers in New York City concerning their attitude toward the ASPIRA Consent Decree. In addition the investigation examined teachers' self-perceptions and supervisors' perceptions of the teaching behavior of teachers. Through data analysis it was determined that bilingual teachers in schools with both high and low percentages of Spanish-speaking students, had a significantly more positive attitude toward the ASPIRA Consent Decree than the monolingual teacher. Although not supported by factual information, monolingual teachers significantly more than bilingual teachers felt that the ASPIRA Consent Decree was a causal factor in the dismissal of monolingual teachers. Bilingual and monolingual teachers did not differ significantly in their perceptions of their teaching behavior. Similarly, supervisors did not perceive any significant difference between the teaching behavior of the monolingual and bilingual teacher.

Mrs. D. Navarra and Ms. L. Gonzalez, Field Coordinators For Bilingual Education in the Newark Public School System,

were most gracious and helpful in extending me the opportunity to interview them on a variety of subjects indigenous to this study. Both coordinators were in agreement that the bilingual program in Newark is progressing in a very positive direction, and most especially, this year. Furthermore, they felt that policies and procedures have been redefined, clarified and instituted which will begin to insure consistency throughout the city. Both women stated that they felt teacher attitudes were determined by school environment and the administration; consequently, they could not make a blanket statement concerning all teachers. Mrs. Navarra did feel that negative attitudes held by some teachers in a few select schools were due to inconsistencies within those schools that do not adhere to program policy as set forth by Newark. When queried as to the possible enactment of a national comprehensive policy governing bilingual education, Mrs. Navarra stated that such a policy should not and could not exist across the nation.

In summation, bilingual education remains as perhaps the most debated movement in American education during the past ten years. Current thinking, perceptions and attitudes are far from uniform and the multitude of fundamental concerns which impinge on bilingualism are still undergoing change and controversy.

The research presented herein identifies some of the existing problems and feelings, but at the same time reveals

the promise of this educational process. Positive teacher attitudes toward the bilingual program per se, the native language and culture are all recognized as significant influencing variables which must be considered in evaluating program success.

Clearly a more comprehensive research effort with interrelated goals is necessary in order to learn more about the nature and effects of bilingual education, and to formulate policy, evaluation instruments and practices. Bilingual education is still in its infancy, and is deserving of the opportunity to prove its value and effectiveness.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Agheyisi, R. and Fishman, J. A. "Language Attitude Studies: A Brief Survey of Methodological Approaches". Anthropological Linguistics, XII, (1970), 137-57.

American Institudes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/ English Bilingual Education Program. Vol. I: Study Design and Interim Findings. Palo Alto, Calif.: 1977.

Andersson, Theodore and Boyer, Mildred, eds. Bilingual Schooling In the United States. Vol. I. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1976.

Anemoyanis, Vivian. "Teachers' Attitudes Toward the ASPIRA Consent Decree and Perceptions of Teachers and Supervisors of Teachers' Classroom Behavior in Bilingual and Non-Bilingual Programs": Ph. D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1979.

Arias, Beatriz, and Gray, Tracy. "The Importance of Teacher and Student Attitudes On Achievement In Bilingual-Bicultural Education". Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York, April 1977.

Campbell, R. N.; Taylor, D. M.; and Tucker, G. R. "Teachers' Views of Immersion-Type Bilingual Programs: A Quebec Example. Foreign Language Annals, VII (1973), 106-10.

Center for Applied Linguistics. Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Linguistics. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

ESEA Title VII Bilingual-Bicultural Education Program, 1975-76, Milwaukee Public Schools. Wisconsin Dept. of Educational Research and Program Assessment, 1976.

Flores, Solomon. "The Nature and Effectiveness of Bilingual Education Programs For the Spanish-Speaking Child in the United States". Ph. D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1969.

Frender, R. and Lambert, W. E. "Speech Style And Scholastic Success: the Tentative Relationships and Possible Implications For Lower Social Class Children". Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects. Edited by R. W. Shuy, Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1973.

Gingras, Rosario C. Information Specialist, National Clearinghouse For Bilingual Education. Personal letter, Rosslyn, Virginia, 25 October 1979.

Illivicky, Martin. "Bilingual Education-Politics or Process?" NASSP Bulletin, 60 (December 1976), 56-59.

Juarez, Paul H. "The Views of Public School Board Trustees and School Superintendents on Selected Issues In the Area of Bilingual-Bicultural Education". Ph. D. dissertation, United States International University, 1975.

Mc Nicholas, Patricia. "An Assessment of Perceptions of Urban Parents and School Personnel Toward Bilingual-Bicultural Education". Ph. D. dissertation, University of Houston, 1977.

Medina, Arturo. "Attitudes Towards Bilingualism of Project Administrators In the Federally Funded Bilingual Programs of Texas". Ph. D. dissertation, Texas A & M University, 1973.

Naremore, R. C. "Teachers' Judgments of Childrens' Speech: A Factor Analytic Study of Attitudes". Ph. D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1969.

Navarra, D. and Gonzalez, Linda, Bilingual Department of Education, Newark, New Jersey. Interview, October 1979.

Ornstein, Jacob. "Bilingual Education - boon or boondoggle?" N.J.E.A. Review, October, 1979, pp. 16-18.

Paulston, Christina Pratt. "Theoretical Perspectives on Bilingual Education". Paper presented at the Bilingual Higher Education Institute, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N. J., August 26, 1979.

Quintana, Susan and Ramirez, Albert. "Educators' Attitudes, Perceptions and Knowledge About Bilingual-Bicultural Education". Atisbos Journal of Chicano Research. (Winter 76-77), 97-106.

Saville, Muriel R. and Troike, Rudolph. A Hankbook of Bilingual Education. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

Seligman, C. R.; Tucker, G. R.; and Lambert, W. E. "The Effects of Speech Style and Other Attributes On Teachers' Attitudes Toward Pupils". Language In Society, 1972.

Shuy, R. W. and Fasold, R. W., eds. Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1973.

Stansfield, Charles. Boulder Moves Ahead: An Evaluation of the English As A Second Language Tutorial Program of the Boulder Valley Public Schools, During Its First Year of Operation: 1975-76. Denver, Colorado: State Dept. of Ed., 1976.

University Microfilms International, Bilingual-Bicultural Education: Titles and Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations. Los Angeles: National Dissemination and Assessment Center - ESEA, Title VII School of Education. 1977.

APPENDIX

January 25, 1980

Dear Administrators and Teachers,

As many of you know, I am presently writing my thesis for my Master's Degree at Kean College. The opinionnaire which you have just received will form an integral part of my thesis. Therefore, I would be most grateful if you would take time to respond to all questions and statements as candidly as possible. As all responses are to be anonymous, your name and room number should not be written on your opinionnaire.

Please place your completed form in the large box bearing my name on the office counter, sometime before 3 o'clock today.

Thank you for your usual cooperation.

Sincerely,
V. Kanowith
V. Kanowith

Dear Teachers,

I encourage you to respond to this opinionnaire since it represents an opportunity to express your views and opinions. Your responses may prove helpful in focusing attention on any areas of concern.

Yours truly,
Noah Marshall
Noah Marshall, Jr., Principal